REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 15, 2009. Claims 24-32 are presented for examination, of which Claims 24, 27 and 30 are in independent form. Claims 24, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 32 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 24-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,361,332 (Yoshida et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0002063 (Oomura et al.).

Applicant submits that the independent claims, together with their dependent claims, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The present invention relates to the transmission to a printer of a specific font with a coding scheme that is supported by the printer.

First of all, Applicant notes that a font can be characterized as a relationship between a character encoding (set of codes for respective characters; also known as coding scheme, code system, etc.) and a glyph set (*see* http://www.cs.tut.fi/~jkorpela/chars.html and http://www.j-a-b.net/web/char/char-general, for examples). On the one hand, coding schemes can be converted to one another based on shared characters. On the other hand, each glyph set can be represented in different formats, such as outline fonts, bitmap fonts, etc. (*see* http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Computer_font, for example).[1]

---

[1] These sites are not cited as prior art, or as admissible evidence, but are merely referred to as providing a clear discussion of this point.

According to aspects of the present invention, an apparatus with its control method allows a user to send from a PC to a printer (Fig. 2, S201) a print job that requires a specific font (S203). The apparatus identifies the 1) coding scheme associated with the specific font (S204, para. [0035]) and also gets a list of coding schemes supported by the printer (S202).

If the coding scheme associated with the specific font is on the list of coding schemes supported by the printer, the apparatus retrieves the specific font from the PC and puts the coding scheme in an appropriate format (S206) before sending the font to the printer (S210). Otherwise, the apparatus allows the user to choose 2) an entry from the list of coding schemes supported by the printer (S208). It then retrieves the specific font from the PC and 1) to 2) based on a conversion table before sending the font with the converted coding scheme to the printer (S209).

Specifically, the conversion table contains conversion information with respect to a predetermined, intermediate coding scheme – typically one of the Unicode coding schemes, where conversion from or to such a coding scheme is normally feasible (Fig. 4). The conversion from 1) to 2) is then performed by mapping 1) to the predetermined, intermediate coding scheme, which is readily mapped to 2) (para. [0042]).[2]

Claim 24 recites, among other features, "a display unit configured to display a selection window for accepting a user selection of a code system [this would be 2)] from the list of the code systems obtained by the first obtainment unit when the determination unit determines that the code system [this would be 1)] obtained by the second obtainment unit is not included in the list of code systems."

---

[2] **Error! Main Document Only.** It is to be understood that the scope of the claims is not limited by the details of this or any other embodiment that may be referred to.

The feature quoted above is not believed to be disclosed or suggested in *Yoshida* and *Oomura*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

Yoshida relates to a method which, when desired font data is not available in a designated information processing device (IPD), transmits so-called optimal font data, which may or may not be identical to the desired font data, from another IPD to the designated IPD (*see* col. 1, line 53 through col. 2, line 2). Specifically, each IPD has a font manager that develops an outline font to a bitmap font – both being *glyph set formats* (*see* col. 8, lines 61-63). Before transmitting the optimal font data, the *Yoshida* method converts the outline font in the optimal font data to another outline font as necessary to make sure that the transmitted data can be processed by the font manager on the designated IPD (*see* Fig. 11 and 12, for example). Accordingly, *Yoshida* does not concern individual *coding schemes*, and certainly not the selection of one or the conversion between two of them.

The portion of *Yoshida* cited in the Office Action as disclosing the display unit of Claim 24 describes merely the determination of whether there exists an IPD that has a designated font manager and contains a specific outline font (*see* Fig. 6, S602), the selection of such an IPD (*see* S603), the determination of whether there exists an IPD that has the designated font manager and contains an outline font that can be converted to the specific outline font (S604), and the selection of such an IPD (S605). Apparently, then, the display unit and the dependent conversion unit of Claim 24 are missing from *Yoshida*.

Oomura is not believed to remedy the deficiency discussed above. *Oomura* relates to an apparatus which generates, for a printing instruction with an embedded font, a predetermined intermediate code format, for which it then generates a printer control command (*see* Abstract). The intermediate code format normally comprises a coding scheme which is

based on a large number of characters and is supported by a typical printer (*see* para. [0076], [0274] and [0285], for example).

According to a preferred embodiment, an application on behalf of a user submits a print job (*see* Fig. 15, A1 and A2) and registers in the graphic engine as part of the OS a font embedded in the print job so that it can be used by the spooler (*see* A3 and G1). A spooler generates for the embedded font an intermediate code format (*see* S3). To prep the printer driver loaded by the graphic engine, a despooler reproduces the intermediate code format (*see* D2). A print deriver then generates for the intermediate code format a printer control command (*see* Drv3).

Specifically, when a coding scheme associated with the embedded font is not supported by the OS and thus cannot be handled by the printer driver, the graphic engine identifies the glyph index representing a glyph set for the embedded font (*see* Fig. 8, para. [0048] and [0269], for example). The printer driver then generates printer control commands using the glyph index instead of any specific coding scheme (*see* para. [0276]). In this way, it does not matter which encoding schemes are *supported by the OS*.

Apparently, then, while it might involve conversion between an encoding scheme associated with a specific embedded font to an intermediate code format, *Oomura* does not concern, when a specific coding scheme is not on a list of coding schemes *supported by a printer*, the display of the list of coding schemes and the selection by a user of one of them. Therefore, the display unit and the dependent conversion unit are also missing from *Oomura*.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above, Claim 24 is believed patentable over *Yoshida* and *Oomura*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

Independent Claims 27 and 30 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 24 and, therefore, are also believed to be patentable over the *Yoshida* and *Oomura* for the reasons discussed above.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a references against the independent claims. Therefore, the independent claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3645791_1.DOC